

Application No. 09/408,873

REMARKS

The FINAL Office Action of December 5, 2003 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 9, 18, 21, 25, and 29 are independent claims. An Amendment mailed September 29, 2003 amended claims 1, 9, 18, 21 and 29. As discussed below, this Amendment amends claims 18 and 29 and cancels claims 1-17 and 21-24.

1. Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102/103 of Claims 1-17 and 21-24

The Office Action in sections 9-27 on pages 4-10 rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 6-13, 15-17, and 21-24 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kinko, U.S. 6,583,811 B2 (hereinafter Kinko). Further, the Office Action in sections 34-38 on pages 13-15 rejects dependent claims 3, 5, 14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinko. In order to place this Application in better condition for allowance, Applicant cancels claims 1-17 and 21-24.

2. Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102 of Claims 18-20 and 29-30

The Office Action in sections 28-33 on pages 10-13 rejects claims 18-20, 29, and 30 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Meyers, U.S. Patent No. 6,137,535 (hereinafter Myers). Further, the Office Action in sections 2-5 provides additional comments with regard to Applicant's amendments to independent claims 18 and 29 previously introduced.

In response thereto Applicant amends independent claims 18 and 29 to more clearly set forth that unlike Myers, Applicant's claimed image acquisition system and method therefor include at least one lens of a plurality of cameras that shifts relative to at least another lens of the plurality of cameras for adjusting its view of the area recorded by the plurality of cameras. Support for these amendments is found on page 26, lines 1-18.

More specifically, Myers discloses a compact digital camera formed with a lenslet array. While being compact, the lenslet array disclosed by Myers is fixed and may not be adjustable as is the image acquisition system described and claimed by Applicant. Unlike Myers, Applicant describes and claims an image acquisition system that includes a plurality of cameras with at least one lens of the plurality of

Application No. 09/408,873

cameras that shifts relative to at least another lens of the plurality of cameras for adjusting its view of the area recorded by the plurality of cameras.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 18 and 29 as amended are patentably distinguishable over Myers because the single camera with a lenslet array is not adjustable in the manner claimed by Applicant. Insofar as claims 19, 20, and 30 are concerned, these claims depend from one of now presumably allowable independent claims 18 or 29 and are also believed to be in allowable condition.

3. Allowable Claims

Sections 39-40 on page 15 of the Office Action indicates that claims 25-28 are allowed. The undersigned appreciates this indication of allowable subject matter.


4. Fee Authorization And Extension Of Time

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment or response, however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

5. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiner considers a personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is hereby requested to call Attorney for Applicant(s), Thomas Zell.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas Zell
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,481
Telephone: 650-812-4282
Date: 2/5/2004